

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

JAMES R. TURNER,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 24-CV-856-JPS

JOAN M. HANNULA, MD and AMY  
DENNEAU, APNP,

**ORDER**

Defendants.

Plaintiff James R. Turner, an inmate confined at Fox Lake Correctional Institution, filed a pro se complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging that Defendants violated his constitutional rights by failing to provide him adequate medical treatment. This Order screens Plaintiff's complaint and resolves his motion for leave to proceed without prepaying the filing fee.

**1. MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED WITHOUT PREPAYING  
THE FILING FEE**

The Prison Litigation Reform Act ("PLRA") applies to this case because Plaintiff was a prisoner when he filed his complaint. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(h). The PLRA allows the Court to give a prisoner plaintiff the ability to proceed with his case without prepaying the civil case filing fee. *Id.* § 1915(a)(2). When funds exist, the prisoner must pay an initial partial filing fee. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1). He must then pay the balance of the \$350 filing fee over time, through deductions from his prisoner account. *Id.*

On August 5, 2024, the Court ordered Plaintiff to pay an initial partial filing fee of \$15.70. Plaintiff paid that fee on August 26, 2024. The Court will grant Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed without prepaying

the filing fee. ECF No. 2. He must pay the remainder of the filing fee over time in the manner explained at the end of this Order.

## 2. SCREENING THE COMPLAINT

### 2.1 Federal Screening Standard

Under the PLRA, the Court must screen complaints brought by prisoners seeking relief from a governmental entity or an officer or employee of a governmental entity. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). The Court must dismiss a complaint if the prisoner raises claims that are legally “frivolous or malicious,” that fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or that seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b).

In determining whether the complaint states a claim, the Court applies the same standard that applies to dismissals under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). *See Cesal v. Moats*, 851 F.3d 714, 720 (7th Cir. 2017) (citing *Booker-El v. Superintendent, Ind. State Prison*, 668 F.3d 896, 899 (7th Cir. 2012)). A complaint must include “a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). The complaint must contain enough facts, accepted as true, to “state a claim for relief that is plausible on its face.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)). “A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows a court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Id.* (citing *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 556).

To state a claim for relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege that someone deprived him of a right secured by the Constitution or the laws of the United States and that whoever deprived him of this right was acting under the color of state law. *D.S. v. E. Porter Cnty. Sch. Corp.*, 799

F.3d 793, 798 (7th Cir. 2015) (citing *Buchanan-Moore v. County of Milwaukee*, 570 F.3d 824, 827 (7th Cir. 2009)). The Court construes pro se complaints liberally and holds them to a less stringent standard than pleadings drafted by lawyers. *Cesal*, 851 F.3d at 720 (citing *Perez v. Fenoglio*, 792 F.3d 768, 776 (7th Cir. 2015)).

## **2.2 Plaintiff's Allegations**

Plaintiff alleges that Defendants Joan M. Hannula, MD ("Hannula") and Amy Denneau, APNP ("Denneau") were negligent by prescribing him medication that he was clearly allergic to. ECF No. 1 at 1. Plaintiff first saw Hannula at Stanley Correctional Institution ("SCI") around October 22, 2018. *Id.* at 2. Hannula reviewed Plaintiff's medical files and requested that he remain on the medication simvastatin. *Id.* On May 16, 2019, Hannula changed Plaintiff's medication to atorvastatin. *Id.* Plaintiff had various follow-up visits with Hannula in 2020 and 2021; he remained on atorvastatin that entire time. *Id.*

On December 12, 2022, Plaintiff arrived at Fox Lake Correctional Institution ("FLCI"). *Id.* At that time, he saw Denneau and he remained on atorvastatin. *Id.* Plaintiff saw Denneau various times in 2023 and remained on atorvastatin. *Id.* Plaintiff complained of a skin rash around his groin, back, neck, and arms at both SCI and FLCI. *Id.* at 3. On November 30, 2022, Plaintiff complained about the rash to Vellema Tracy. *Id.* Plaintiff alleges that he was allergic to the medication that Defendants prescribed him. *Id.* Plaintiff maintains that Defendants would have been aware of his allergy if they had looked in his medical files. *Id.* Plaintiff's side effects from the medication included yellowing of the eye, a skin rash, dark urine, unusual tiredness, muscle pain, nausea, abdominal pain, and an upset stomach. *Id.*

### 2.3 Analysis

The Court finds that Plaintiff may not proceed against Defendants on an Eighth Amendment deliberate indifference claim for their indifference to Plaintiff's serious medical need. The Eighth Amendment secures an inmate's right to medical care. Prison officials violate this right when they "display deliberate indifference to serious medical needs of prisoners." *Greeno v. Daley*, 414 F.3d 645, 652 (7th Cir. 2005) (internal quotation omitted). Deliberate indifference claims contain both an objective and a subjective component: the inmate "must first establish that his medical condition is objectively, 'sufficiently serious,'; and second, that prison officials acted with a 'sufficiently culpable state of mind,' i.e., that they both knew of and disregarded an excessive risk to inmate health." *Lewis v. McLean*, 864 F.3d 556, 562–63 (7th Cir. 2017) (quoting *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 834 (1994) (internal citations omitted)). Deliberate indifference requires "[s]omething more than negligence or even malpractice." *Pyles v. Fahim*, 771 F.3d 403, 409 (7th Cir. 2014).

Here, the Court does not find that Plaintiff states sufficient factual allegations to proceed against Defendants for an Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants were negligent in prescribing him medication he was allergic to because they failed to look at his medical files. Plaintiff does not, however, allege that he ever told either Defendant that the medicines were negatively affecting him. As currently pled, Plaintiff's allegations at most show negligence or malpractice, but nothing indicates that Defendants were aware of or intentionally gave him a medication that caused allergic reactions. Plaintiff may state a state-law negligence claim; however, in the absence of a federal claim, the Court cannot exercise supplemental jurisdiction over a state-law

negligence claim. The Court will provide Plaintiff the opportunity to amend the complaint and provide more information. If Plaintiff believes he can successfully state an Eighth Amendment claim, he must file an amended complaint curing the deficiencies as described herein. An amended complaint must be filed on or before **October 18, 2024**. Failure to file an amended complaint within this time period may result in dismissal of this action.

When writing his amended complaint, Plaintiff should provide the Court with enough facts to answer the following questions: (1) Who violated his constitutional rights?; (2) What did each person do to violate his rights?; (3) Where did each person violate his rights?; and (4) When did each person violate his rights? Plaintiff's amended complaint does not need to be long or contain legal language or citations to statutes or cases, but it does need to provide the Court and each Defendant with notice of what each Defendant allegedly did or did not do to violate his rights.

The Court is enclosing a copy of its amended complaint form. Plaintiff must list all of the defendants in the caption of his amended complaint. He should use the spaces on pages two and three to allege the key facts that give rise to the claims he wishes to bring, and to describe which defendants he believes committed the violations that relate to each claim. If the space is not enough, Plaintiff may use up to five additional sheets of paper.

Plaintiff is advised that the amended complaint must bear the docket number assigned to this case and must be labeled "Amended Complaint." The amended complaint supersedes the prior complaints and must be complete in itself without reference to the prior complaints. *See Duda v. Bd. of Educ. of Franklin Park Pub. Sch. Dist. No. 84*, 133 F.3d 1054, 1056 (7th Cir.

1998). In *Duda*, the appellate court emphasized that in such instances, the “prior pleading is in effect withdrawn as to all matters not restated in the amended pleading.” *Id.* at 1057 (citation omitted). If an amended complaint is received, it will become the operative complaint in this action, and the Court will screen it in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.

Accordingly,

**IT IS ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s motion for leave to proceed without prepaying the filing fee, ECF No. 2, be and the same is hereby **GRANTED**;

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the complaint fails to state a federal claim;

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff may file an amended complaint that complies with the instructions in this Order on or before **October 18, 2024**. If Plaintiff files an amended complaint by the deadline, the Court will screen the amended complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. If Plaintiff does not file an amended complaint by the deadline, the Court will dismiss this case based on a lack of jurisdiction;

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk’s Office mail Plaintiff a blank prisoner amended complaint form and a copy of the guides entitled “Answers to Prisoner Litigants’ Common Questions” and “Answers to Pro Se Litigants’ Common Questions,” along with this Order;


**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the agency having custody of Plaintiff shall collect from his institution trust account the \$334.30 balance of the filing fee by collecting monthly payments from Plaintiff’s prison trust account in an amount equal to 20% of the preceding month’s income credited to Plaintiff’s trust account and forwarding payments to the Clerk of Court each time the amount in the account exceeds \$10 in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(2). The payments shall be clearly identified by the

case name and number assigned to this case. If Plaintiff is transferred to another county, state, or federal institution, the transferring institution shall forward a copy of this Order along with his remaining balance to the receiving institution; and

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that a copy of this Order be sent to the officer in charge of the agency where Plaintiff is confined.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 27th day of September, 2024.

BY THE COURT:



J. P. Stadtmueller  
U.S. District Judge

Plaintiffs who are inmates at Prisoner E-Filing Program institutions shall submit all correspondence and case filings to institution staff, who will scan and e-mail documents to the Court. Prisoner E-Filing is mandatory for all inmates at Columbia Correctional Institution, Dodge Correctional Institution, Green Bay Correctional Institution, Oshkosh Correctional Institution, Waupun Correctional Institution, and Wisconsin Secure Program Facility.

Plaintiffs who are inmates at all other prison facilities, or who have been released from custody, will be required to submit all correspondence and legal material to:

Office of the Clerk  
United States District Court  
Eastern District of Wisconsin  
362 United States Courthouse  
517 E. Wisconsin Avenue  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202

**DO NOT MAIL ANYTHING DIRECTLY TO THE COURT'S CHAMBERS.** If mail is received directly to the Court's chambers, **IT WILL BE RETURNED TO SENDER AND WILL NOT BE FILED IN THE CASE.**

Plaintiff is further advised that failure to timely file any brief, motion, response, or reply may result in the dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute. In addition, the parties must notify the Clerk of Court of any change of address. **IF PLAINTIFF FAILS TO PROVIDE AN UPDATED ADDRESS TO THE COURT AND MAIL IS RETURNED TO THE COURT AS UNDELIVERABLE, THE COURT WILL DISMISS THIS ACTION WITHOUT PREJUDICE.**